'I am not a German Jew. I am a Jew with a German passport': German-Jewish identification among Jewish Germans and Jewish German Israelis

Hochman, Oshrat; Heilbrunn, Sibylle

This is an accepted manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis inIdentities:
Global Studies in Culture and Power, Vol. 25, 2016, No. 1, pp. 104-123
available online at: https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2016.1214133
Page numbers have been adjusted to the publishers version, whereby this postprint is fully quotable.

'I am not a German Jew. I am a Jew with a German passport': German-Jewish identification among Jewish Germans and Jewish German Israelis

Oshrat Hochman[a,b] and Sibylle Heilbrunn[c,d]

[a]School of Social and Community Studies, Ruppin Academic Center, Israel; [b]GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Mannheim, Germany; [c]School of Social Sciences and Humanities, Kinneret Academic Center, Sea of Galilee, Israel; [d]Department of Sociology, Univesity of Haifa, Haifa, Israel

ABSTRACT
The aim of this study is to explore the way German-Jews negotiate their German and Jewish cultural self-identifications. Given that Jewish and German identities represent both ethnic and national identities, we conceptualize their construction and reconstruction referring to theories of national identity. To describe the outcomes of the negotiation processes observed, we recruit Berry's acculturation theory. This theory provides a valuable framework to conceptualize the integration of two cultural self-identifications.
The German-Jewish-Israeli setting is particularly interesting due to the complex relations between the three social groups emerging in the aftermath of the Holocaust. To explore the participants' German, Jewish and Israeli self-identifications and the role of the Holocaust in their construction and reconstruction, we conducted 18 in-depth interviews. Findings imply that the Holocaust plays a role in the construction of an integrated German-Jewish identification. Yet, the Holocaust and its consequences notwithstanding, an integrated German-Jewish self-identification is possible.

KEYWORDS Ethnic and national identity; identification; acculturation; Israel; Germany

Introduction

This study aims to explore how German-Jews negotiate their German and Jewish cultural self-identifications. Given that Jewish and German identities represent both ethnic and national identities (e.g. Brubaker 1989; Smooha 2004; Weissbrod 1983), we find it useful to conceptualize their construction and reconstruction referring to theories of national identity. To describe the outcomes of the negotiation processes observed, we recruit Berry's (1990) acculturation theory. This theory provides a valuable framework to conceptualize the integration of two cultural self-identifications.

CONTACT Oshrat Hochman, Oshrat.Hochman@gesis.or

Two main models of national identity dominate the national identity discourse, namely the voluntarist (civic) and the ascribed (organic, ethnic) models (Kohn 1962, 1994; Smith 1991; Zimmer 2003). The voluntarist model of national identity implies that national identity is associated with voluntarist engagement like compliance with state values and institutions, language acquisition and so on. The ascribed model of national identity implies that national identity is ascribed through ancestry, religion or race.
Kohn (1994) proposed that the two models of national identity represent two different national logics. This proposition was empirically confirmed by studies indicating that the voluntarist\ascribed dichotomy presents a useful tool to describe patterns of national identity across different national contexts (Jones and Smith 2001; Kunovich 2009).
Smith (1991), however, pointed out, that in most cases, national identity contains elements of both the ethnic/ascribed and the civic/voluntarist models (see also Heath and Tilly 2005; Hjerm 1998). Moreover, the dynamic nature of national membership and national identity (e.g. Brubaker 1996; Joppke 1999) requires a perspective that accounts for changes not only in the composition of national identity, but also in the meanings attached to its different elements.
Addressing these points, Zimmer (2003) proposed to differentiate between the voluntarist and ascribed (organic) mechanisms social actors use to construct and reconstruct their national identities, and the symbolic resources they draw upon to do so. Zimmer (2003) defines symbolic resources as cultural resources that provide the ‘symbolic raw material' social actors use to define their national identities in the public discourse (Zimmer 2003). He specifies four symbolic resources, namely political values and\or institutions; culture; history; and geography.
Zimmer's focus lies in the public discourse, where different political groups promote their organic or voluntarist perspective using similar cultural resources (Zimmer 2003). We, however, focus on the way individuals interpret cultural resources using the organic or voluntarist mechanisms in order to claim membership in national/cultural groups (Raijman and Hochman 2011). Specifically, we adopt the common view that self-identification represents a dynamic negotiation between social representations and individual properties and their evaluation (Breakwell 2001; Schwartz 2005; Stets and Burke 2000). We view symbolic resources as social representations of the ethno-national group, and boundary mechanisms as ideologies that reflect individuals' evaluations of these representations (Kaufmann 2008).
Beyond the application of Zimmers' (2003) framework on individual actors, this study also seeks to demonstrate how this framework is useful in making sense of the acculturation strategies of individuals negotiating their membership in more than one national (or cultural) group.

Acculturation is a process that takes place when individuals of different cultures meet (Berry 1990). It essentially implies that individuals have the possibility to self-identify with more than one group (Gong 2007; LaFromboise, Coleman, and Gerton 1993; Phinney 1991). In fact, Berry (1997) proposes four strategies of self-identification that may emerge in the meeting of two cultures: integration, separation, marginalization and assimilation (Berry and Sam 1997). The former two types imply retention of attachment to one's erstwhile culture that is or is not accompanied by increasing attachment to the respective 'other' culture (integration or separation, respectively). The latter two types imply a loss of attachment to one's erstwhile culture that is or is not accompanied by lack of attachment to respective 'other' cultures (marginalization or assimilation, respectively).

The acculturation framework presupposes the existence of a 'core' culture in the dominant society, and in the ethnic minority. Although we adopt this point of view throughout our work, it is important to recall that both host and the ethnic societies represent spaces in which culture is constantly constructed and negotiated (e.g. Bhabha 1997; Wimmer 2008). The interviews we conducted do not provide insight into the participants' perceptions on the construction and reconstruction of the two main cultural groups they are or are not part of, or about the actors producing them, and so these processes go beyond the scope of our analysis.

The paper makes two main contributions: first, integrating the notions of voluntarist and ascribed national identity into the model of acculturation, we provide a deeper understanding of the mechanisms underlying self-identification in the context of acculturation, and expand current knowledge regarding the construction of ethno-national identification. Our findings demonstrate how ascribed and voluntarist understandings of national identity determine the permeability of boundaries between different social groups. In this manner, they also determine whether and how the integration of two different identifications is possible. Second, we add a fifth symbolic resource, namely social ties, to the four symbolic resources Zimmer (2003) specified that partake in the construction and reconstruction of national identity. By focusing on the construction of identity in the minds of individuals and not in a political discourse, we demonstrate that social networks assist the individuals we interviewed in drawing distinctions between 'us' and 'them' based on who their friends are. Like other symbolic resources, networks too are interpreted both as voluntarist and as ascribed.

Setting – Jews in Israel and in Germany

Our focus on German and Jewish cultural identifications derives from the fact that these identifications represent classical cases of ethnic-nations

(Brubaker 1992; Smooha 2004).[1] Gavison (1998), for example, points out that being Jewish has a religious meaning, implying a shared ethnic descent; a cultural meaning that does not require adherence to religious laws; and a national counter-religious meaning that developed in the Zionist movement as a reaction to the traditional religious Jewish identity (Gavison 1998, 244-245).

This complexity is extended further by the Jewish-Israeli nexus, according to which all Jews are potential Israeli citizens under the Law of Return (1950). The Law of Return provides all Jews with the right to return to their homeland, thus technically allocating Israeli citizenship to all Jews around the world who choose to immigrate to Israel. Whether a person is Jewish or not is determined by Jewish genealogy and blood ties (Lang 2005).

Historically, Germany represented an ethnic model of the modern nation state (Brubaker 1989). Specifically, being German was for a long time conceptualized in ethnic terms, stressing the shared origin of all Germans regardless of their domicile or territorial whereabouts. This conceptualization of being German was particularly useful in the years of the German separation following the Second World War until its reunification in 1989 (Joppke 1999). With the amendment of the German citizenship law in the late 1990s, this ethnic understanding of the German nation changed, at least formally. Since 1999, German citizenship is no longer limited to individuals with ‘German blood', but is also granted to German-born children of immigrants. This change in the German citizenship law implies that at least formally, being German is no longer a question of ascribed membership, but rather a voluntarist issue: at an age of 17-23, German-born children of foreign nationals must choose between their parent's nationality and the German one. The voluntarist element in German nationality was also emphasized by means of the immigration law passed in 2005, requiring immigrants who wish to naturalize to participate in integration and German language courses (Joppke 2007).

Method

Sample and data collection

The findings presented here rely on semi-structured interviews conducted with 18 individuals, mostly by the second author. Potential participants were approached using a snowball method starting with the networks of the second author, and then utilizing the connections of some of the participants. The sample represents a criterion sample (Patton 2001, 238) in the sense that all of the participants were descendants of Holocaust survivors. Efforts were additionally made to maintain a relatively balanced

gender division among the participants (nine women and nine men), and a balanced ratio of individuals living in Germany and in Israel (nine in Israel and nine in Germany). The average age of the participants was 52, with the two oldest participants being 66 years old and the youngest 43 years old. Except for one person, all were living in family relationships with children. Most, but not all, had a university degree. The interviewees hold diverse professions, but all can be considered upper middle class. Among the persons we interviewed in Germany, some are German-born and others arrived in Germany as young children. Persons living in Israel immigrated in the 1980s and 1990s.

The sampling procedure was consequential for the representativeness of the sample. In general, the Jewish community in contemporary Germany is mainly composed of Jewish immigrants from the FSU who are over represented in lower socio-economic strata (Haug and Wolf 2006). The participants of this study represent a highly selective group of upper middle class, mostly secular Jews. The individuals we interviewed in Israel are first-generation immigrants. Importantly, however, they are members of the Jewish majority and the economically and socially dominant Ashkenazi group (e.g. Haberfeld and Cohen 2007).[2] They provide a comparably better representation of the contemporary German community in the Israeli society.

Analytical approach

Analysis of the materials collected in the interviews was based on full transcriptions made in the language of the interview (mostly German), of which both authors have sufficient knowledge. We followed the ‘grounded theory' method (Strauss and Corbin 1990), breaking the transcripts into discrete parts (paragraphs or sentences), placing them within a conceptual framework, and then reconnecting them by means of the relations between the constructs of this conceptual framework. For the analysis, both researchers first read the transcripts separately in order to cross-validate the main recurring themes (e.g. Hill, Thompson, and Williams 1997). We then discussed our initial impressions evolving from the text materials and identified the main themes after which we reread the transcripts, dividing the 18 texts between us. At this stage, we marked text sections relevant to the themes we selected before, and tried to divide them into narrower topics. In an additional meeting, we compared our markings and discussed similarities and differences between the two coding matrixes, creating subcategories within the different topics. Consequentially, we developed the relations between the different subcategories emerging from the topics, moving them within and between categories in order to locate their meanings in our

conceptual framework. At this stage, we also reflected on Zimmer's (2003) framework of national identity and Berry's acculturation model (e.g. Berry and Sam 1997) and compared the interrelations emerging from the transcripts to those assumed by these conceptual models. Here again, we considered issues of consistency between descriptions of different participants and of the extent to which our generalizations represent their experiences.

Structure of the interview

The themes of all interviews were: (1) the influence of the participants' family history on the preferred country of living; (2) the role of religion and tradition in this choice and in the participants' attitudes and convictions; (3) the participants' social, personal and cultural integration; (4) the preferences of the participants regarding the lifestyles of their children; and (5) the influence of the homeland (Heimat) on the participants' personal and social identifications. The interviews were conducted between 2011 and 2012 in Israel and in Germany, most of them in the participants' homes, and lasted for an average of 1.5 hours.

Findings

In the following section, we present the main findings of our study. The primary question we approached relates to processes of construction and reconstruction of national identification among the participants. In our analysis, we focus on the symbolic resources the participants called upon to delineate their group membership(s) and the boundary mechanisms with which they interpret these resources. Additionally, we explore whether and how the boundary mechanisms are relevant for the integration of a Jewish cultural identification with a German one. Having noticed meaningful differences between the participants living in Germany and those living in Israel, we divided this section into two parts based on the participants' country of residence. In order to assure the anonymity of the participants, we changed their names.

German Jews in Germany

Our exploration of the construction and reconstruction of national identification starts with the self-descriptions of participants. In these self-descriptions, participants often presented the criteria they consider meaningful in order to claim membership in a respective national group. Such criteria can be, for example, found in Stefan's statement below:

I define myself as a Jew with a German passport and with German citizenship.(Germany, male)

Gesine shares this conceptualization, but provides a more detailed description:

If I have to define myself, I would say that I am a German citizen of Jewish faith. (Germany, female)

For Gesine, membership in the German national group is marked by German citizenship or nationality, and Jewish membership by a specific religious belief.
The Jewish membership of the interviewees in Germany is often marked by observing Jewish tradition, which is, however, individually interpreted. Jewish practices were frequently discussed in association with the interviewees' commitment to preserve their Jewish identity and that of their children. These practices are perceived as carriers of the Jewish identity to the next generation even though they deviate from formal Jewish laws. Relating to the role of religion and tradition, Hanno, for example, maintained that:

... When the children were born, we both realized that we wanted to handle it as at home: Leading a secular life, but at the same time making sure that the children know what Judaism means. We celebrate the major holidays, but in a rather non-religious way... (Germany, male)

Stefan too described the Jewish practices maintained at home in association with his son:

We celebrate all holidays in a traditional way and also in the synagogue. I take my son to synagogue on Friday nights or Saturday mornings several times a month. Friday evenings we do the Kiddush, which is the benediction introducing Shabbat and religious Jewish holidays. (Germany, male)

Traditional Jewish practices represent ascribed or inherited symbolic resources for participants' Jewish identification. Yet, they also use tradition as a voluntarist boundary mechanism when stressing their choice whether, how and when to practice tradition. In Hanno's words, he and his partner ‘wanted to handle it' their way. Among the participants living in Germany, Jewish tradition, representing culture, serves as a means to actively claim their Jewish membership and draw a line between this national group, and the German one. Relating to family history, Mareike, provides an explanation for this choice:

The fact that I am living as a Jew in Germany is very important for me. For myself, but more for the memory of my parents and grandparents, I have to be here in order to preserve Jewish live. (Germany, female)

In a way, Mareike states that her commitment to maintaining a Jewish life in Germany is associated with her commitment to the idea that Jews can

live in Germany. A commitment she also associates with her parents and their legacy.
The statements above sustain the relevance of Zimmer's four symbolic resources (Zimmer 2003). The interviewees reflect on their self-identification by reference to history (family), culture (holidays), political institutions (citizenship) and geography (living in Germany). In terms of the ascribed/voluntarist dichotomy, we demonstrate that tradition and religion, which often mark an ethnic/ascribed mechanism, are also interpreted in a voluntarist way. This finding supports the position that an ascribed/voluntarist dichotomy oversimplifies processes of national identification. The interviews indicate, however, that these four symbolic resources are not exhaustive. As we demonstrate below, there is another symbolic resource that Zimmer (2003) failed to specify, namely social ties. Focusing on the public discourse and not on individual constructions of national identity, the absence of social networks from Zimmer's framework is not surprising. For many of our interviewees, networks represent an important tool for the demarcation of group boundaries. Talking about her parents' feelings towards the possibility that she or her siblings will have Catholic German friends, Julia, for example, maintained that:

We children went to a Catholic elementary school and later to high school, but should have had no German friends, because 'those out there are our enemies'. (Germany, female)

German friends were, for Julia's parents, a symbol for boundary crossing into enemy lines. Hanno too mentioned parental control when discussing his past friendships.

There were also young people my age, in whose families contact with non-Jewish classmates was strictly forbidden. My parents were a bit uneasy when I had a non-Jewish girlfriend ... In many families, this option was not even discussed. It was simply clear that one does not go so far.... (Germany, male)

Hanno and Julia present the issue of friendships as a voluntarist one that involves parents' decision whether to allow or prohibit contact with non-Jewish Germans. Relating to preferences and lifestyles of her children, Gesine describes how she uses her parental authority to allow them this contact:

I don't want to give my children the feeling that they have to be different and that they have to socialize with particular people. Here is their home and this is their homeland and if they have German non-Jewish friends that is no problem for me. (Germany, female)

Among the interviewees in Germany, friendships clearly mark a boundary between their own and the German groups. Their strong emphasis on whether crossing this boundary was allowed or not, implies that for them,

as for their parents, friendships denote a voluntarist mechanism: given the opportunities available, you could cross the boundaries if you wanted to. Identity theory maintains that networks provide individuals with opportunities to act in ways that reflect and confirm their role-identity (Stets and Burke 2000). Accordingly, network homophily is understood to imply loyalty to the Jewish group and membership in it.
Networks and social ties were of similar importance also for the participants we interviewed in Israel. Before we move on to them, we further explore the acculturation strategies of the interviewees in Germany. Describing themselves as German and Jewish, they develop a strategy of integration. Importantly, this acculturation strategy is made possible due to the different symbolic resources the participants in this study draw on to describe their identification. While German identification is associated with institutional civic values, Jewish identification is associated with history and culture. The two identifications thus do not force a choice.
Although the participants describe an integration strategy, they construct clear boundaries between the two identifications and often perceive these boundaries to be impermeable. Mareike, for example, noted that:

I don't feel a stranger in Germany, but as a Jew it's always a bit special. I wish it were normal to speak Hebrew without police guarding the synagogue or in the subway. But that doesn't work. I do not know if that's a feeling of strangeness, but in any case it is not normal. (Germany, female)

Mareike voiced a feeling of strangeness that evolves from the institutional construction of the relations between the Jewish minority and the German majority, expressed by the German police outside the synagogue. It is hard to discern from this statement whether she considers the boundaries to be impermeable because the police marks them so clearly, or because police protection around synagogues in Germany is required (due to some general hostility towards Jews). Steffi provided a clearer interpretation for the feeling of strangeness that emerged when she told her colleagues about the past of her Jewish family:

When I told my colleagues that I have Jewish ancestry ... a query came up: 'So, you come from a Jewish family? And I said: Yes, half ... the grandfathers yes, grandmothers not .... Explaining the relationship, I have noticed Hm? Suddenly their behaviour towards me changes – is different. But how different? What is different? I could not really describe it: More cautious, friendly … we were no longer at ease. (Female, Germany)

From Steffi's statement, it is clear that the boundaries between Jews and Germans are constructed by the Germans. She herself was not expecting them. However, among other interviewees we interviewed maintained that

the boundaries were subjectively defined and associated with the Holocaust. Stefan and Gesine, for example, explained that:

Today I would define myself as a Jew living in Germany, or as German. But I would never say as my grandfather said with pride, 'I am German of Jewish faith'. That has, of course, to do with the history of my family. (Germany, male)

It is definitely great that I have found my home here, taking into account the history of my family ... I do not ask myself all the time whether I am a Jewish German or a German Jew. Nevertheless, I would not say I am German. That does sound a little weird to me. Anyhow, I feel at home in Germany and I am completely integrated. (Germany, female)

Both participants understand the boundaries of the German national group as permeable. Like Steffy, Stefan and Gesine too understand their Jewish identification to be defined by symbolic resources that imply ascription. Unlike Mareike and Steffy, they perceive the boundaries of the German group to be based on a voluntarist mechanism.
The interviewees we talked to in Germany confirmed our assumption that the integration of a German and a Jewish identification is challenging. Although they feel attached to both groups, they take great care to demarcate their boundaries. In the participants' own words, although they are German and Jewish, they do not view themselves as German-Jews. In this regard, our interviewees in Germany do not follow the pattern of hyphenated identity that Lang (2005) discovers in the US.
We believe that for many of the individuals we interviewed in Germany, the need to maintain clear boundaries between Jewish and German self-identifications reflects the consequences of a cultural trauma. A cultural trauma, according to Jeffrey Alexander (2004), occurs when members of a collective experience a horrific event that leaves an indelible mark on the collective consciousness and changes its future collective identity. The memory of such an event is catastrophic and threatening both to the existence of the culture and to the existence and identity of the individuals who belong to the culture.

German Jews in Israel

Similar to the case of the interviewees residing in Germany, also in the case of those residing in Israel, we identified the symbolic resources the interviewees use to define the boundaries of their cultural groups and the meanings derived from these resources in terms of membership mechanisms – ascribed or voluntarist. In addition, we explored whether and how the interviewees in Israel integrate their German and Jewish identifications.
We soon realized that Jewish identification among the participants living in Israel is in many cases minor compared to their Israeli identification. In

Thomas' self-described identification, for example, ‘Jewish' is completely missing:

In Germany I am Israeli and in Israel I am German. I'm a bit of both. (Israel, male)

An explanation for the absence of Jewish identity may be found in Jan's and Marita's statements:

Whether the Jewish culture and tradition have any impact on my life, my family and the education of my son? I would answer that with a sentence I once said which I still believe in very much: Israel is the only place in the world where one can safely and confidently stop to be a Jew.' (Israel, male) Today I live a completely normal life. Being a Jew has no relevance anymore. In Germany, this was very important, and here you simply are. It is something natural, nothing imposed. (Israel, female)

Marita's clarification is informative in the sense that for her, one does not ‘stop to be a Jew', but rather being Jewish in Israel is ‘normal' and probably implies less effort or self-awareness. Heike provides a similar explanation to the fact that her commitment to Jewish practices weakened after her immigration to Israel:

I also find that the Jewish identity can be more easily maintained in the Diaspora. We already live in Israel, and that's for a lot of people here Jewish enough. (Israel, female)

The practice of Jewish culture, an important element in the construction of Jewish identification among the interviewees in Germany, could have assisted the participants in Israel in demonstrating their membership in the dominant Jewish society and their integration. However, the interviewees in Israel report that this element in their self-identification plays a minor role if any. Once they arrive in Israel, the interviewees feel relieved from the need to actively mark their Jewish group membership by adhering to Jewish tradition. Interestingly, the relevance of Jewish identification among the participants we interviewed in Israel appeared mostly in their reflections about their children's Jewish identification, and the outcomes it may have for their identification. Simona thus maintains:

I do not want to live with my children in Germany because I do not want assimilation. It's about a Jewish identity for my children and my grandchildren. They should marry Jewish and raise Jewish children. And this I can ensure much better in Israel. (Israel, female)

For Simona, Jewish identity will be preserved only through ascription: if her children will marry Jewish partners. In order to make sure they do so, she prefers to live in Israel. Kirsten too, finds ascription very central for the

preservation of a Jewish identification. Describing her feelings at the birth of her nephew, the son of her Jewish sister and not Jewish, German brother-in-law she admits:

I had waited so much for this child, but at that moment I could only think about what would I tell my parents now ... Anyway, I already know now that it will be very difficult for me, if eventually something like this will happen with my son. Of course, this feeling is strongest about Germans, but I feel it also towards non-Jews in general. (Israel, female)

Living in Israel decreases Kirsten's fear regarding her son's potential assimilation, just as it does for David:

I probably would not have stayed in Germany if I had had children there. Then I would have left sooner. It would be a problem if my child would have brought a non-Jewish partner home. I do not know why. Emotionally. (Germany, male)

One of the reasons for the shift we observe from a strong voluntarist emphasis on Jewish identification of the participants in Germany to an ascribed one in Israel may be the fact that the fear from assimilation into a majority non-Jewish culture does not exist in Israel. A second reason is likely the stronghold of Jewish ancestry for immigrants in Israel as the only condition relevant for their immigration chances.
Although the context – either in Israel or in Germany – seems to play an important role in the construction of Jewish/Israeli identification, we must be careful in our interpretation. Conducting interviews with different people in Israel and in Germany, we cannot determine if immigration led to the differences we report, or if the observed differences explain why some of the participants immigrated to Israel and others did not. It is, however, clear that the cultural-voluntarist dimension of Jewish identification is weaker among the interviewees in Israel. Instead, they engage in a cultural-voluntarist understanding of their German identification.
Culture and more specifically, language was the main symbolic resource the interviewees in Israel used to describe their German identification. Marita puts it this way:

I also read no literature in Hebrew, too much effort. I do read the newspaper every day and now because of my studies also textbooks. But for relaxation, I read German. (Israel, female)

David too voiced an example for the centrality of the German language in the lives of the Israeli participants:

Germany is not my home – not my 'Heimat', but German is my native language. To this day, it is much easier for me to express myself in German than in Hebrew .... (Israel, male)

Alex argues along the same lines when stating:

I'm called a ‘German-Israeli writer'. I am a German-speaking, German-born Israeli who continues to write in German because of his profession. (Israel, male)

Language is not the sole dimension through which the participants living in Israel experience their German self-identification. Heike, for example, explains,

I have now been here at the ‘Goethe Institute' for 11 years and I live my life in a German ‘bubble'. Sometimes this is even too much. I used to cherish my ‘German-ness': punctuality and order. (Israel, female)

Relating to her social contacts and the emergence of the German ‘bubble' Heike states,

My Hebrew was not so good; therefore, I focused on my native language and wanted a job where I could use my German. Also, I still was very connected with Germany, German culture, in short, order, having all the attributes of Jeckes.[3] (Israel, female)

For Heike, the German ‘bubble' was at once an available social support system and a platform for the preservation of those elements in the German culture that she wanted to keep. Using the term ‘Jeckes' in this context validates our observation that in Israel, being German does not imply a contradiction with being Jewish.
The statements above clarify that the interviewees we talked to in Israel voluntarily maintain their attachment to German language and culture. Importantly though, most of the individuals we interviewed in Israel seem to agree that they do so not in order to separate from the Israeli society or define clear boundaries between them and other Israelis. To the contrary, they do it because in Israel, the preservation of one's heritage culture and language is not contradicting with an Israeli identification.
As in the case of the participants who live in Germany, also among those living in Israel we found that social networks and friendships were often used as symbolic resources for the demarcation of German, Jewish or Israeli national identification. One example for this use of networks is apparent in the following quote from Samuel when describing his life before immigration to Israel:
Actually, I had a ‘split personality', as I called it. On the one hand I had my friends during the week, the German friends, in school or sports club. On the other hand I had the weekends with my Jewish friends and camps.[4] But both sides did not know each other, none knew about the existence of the other. (Germany, male)

Samuel relies on his German and Jewish networks to demonstrate his ‘split-personality'. Describing her childhood in Germany, Marita also associates her networks with her Jewish identification, or indeed lack thereof:

I have lived very much assimilated in Germany. Although I went to a Jewish primary school, when I was 12, 13 years I became very independent. While everyone else was in the Zionist youth in Germany (ZJD) and the other Jewish youth organizations, I had almost only German friends. (Israel, female)

The relationship between networks and self-identification is highly relevant in light of the descriptions the interviewees in Israel provided. The vast majority, reports to have mainly European, German-speaking friends. Michael, for example, explains that:

My circle of friends consists mainly of Israelis who come from Austria and Germany. I have long underestimated the importance of language and culture. With other Israelis, I can reach a certain point of acquaintance, but ultimately my friends are German. (Israel, male)

Relating to the influence of the land of origin on his personal and social identifications, Thomas agrees that friendships with Germans, or in his words ‘Europeans', who share his mentality, come more natural for him:

That depends on whether the native Israelis have parents of European origin. Of course, I am closer to those. There is the same mentality, naturally. I'm not an oriental, although I like humus. (Israel, male)

We believe that for Thomas and Michael, their German-speaking networks imply a lasting attachment to a German identification. Similar to the Jews we interviewed in Germany, who use networks to preserve their Jewish culture, those we interviewed in Israel use them to preserve their German one.
The German identification the participants in Israel describe leads us to the final issue to be discussed in this section, namely the integration of Jewish or Israeli self-identification with a German one. Indeed, based on the interviews we conducted in Israel, we believe that such an integration is taking place. In the Israeli context, this is facilitated by the decline in the importance of the cultural-voluntarist dimension of Jewish identification. Through their immigration, the individuals we interviewed in Israel gained a sense of secured Jewish identification. They no longer feel obligated to prove their group membership in everyday practices or social networks. Once the cultural boundary differentiating them from other Germans is blurred, the contradiction between their Jewish and German identifications no longer exists.
A second factor allowing integration of German identification with a Jewish-Israeli one is the unique position of the interviewees in the wider Jewish-Israeli society. The individuals we interviewed in Israel are first-

generation immigrants that are also members of the dominant Jewish Ashkenazi group. As such, they are typically represented in higher strata than most other immigrant groups (e.g. Haberfeld and Cohen 2007; Raijman and Semyonov 1997; Semyonov and Lewin-Epstein 2015), and their social group dominates social, political and cultural institutions (Smooha 2004). Heike, for example, maintains:

Have I ever felt like a stranger in Israel? Actually, I always do, but it is pleasant. I am thus treated much more accommodatingly and I am also forgiven a lot. I have never suffered from it. (Israel, female)

Heike feels that she is privileged due to her status as an immigrant in Israel. Considering Israel's welcoming policy towards Jewish immigrants, and particularly those arriving from Western Europe, this is not surprising. Jan too expresses his sense of liberty to be different within the Israeli society, and associates it with the fragmented nature of the Israeli society:

I can understand myself as part of Israeli society, because it is no longer a mainstream society. It consists of very different groups, and I belong to one of them rather than to the other. Thus, I am part of a minority in a country where many minorities together make a majority. (Israel, male)

In light of the stratified relations between the different segments Jan describes, it would have been worthwhile asking whether a Jewish immigrant from a middle-eastern country would have also considered the fragmented nature of the Israeli society as permissive.

Conclusions

This study investigated the ethno-national identification preferences of Jews living in Germany and of German-Jewish immigrants in Israel. Stressing the symbolic resources individuals utilize to define their ethno-national categories of membership, we asked which boundary mechanisms these resources represent. Finally, we explored whether and how the interviewees integrate the two (or better yet three) identifications. Given the unique setting of this study, we additionally asked in how far the unique complexity of Jewish-German relations, stemming from the Holocaust, contributes to these processes.
The findings presented above first provide support to Zimmer's proposition that individuals use different symbolic resources to demarcate their ethno-national identity. We were also able to demonstrate that individuals interpret these resources by reference to different boundary mechanisms. Thus, the same symbolic resources can have different implications for individual membership in a respective ethno-national group (Zimmer 2003).

The setting in which individuals construct their ethnic and national identifications also seems to play a role. In Germany, individuals tended to mark their Jewish membership by reference to cultural symbolic resources, and their German membership by reference to institutional resources like nationality or citizenship. Although they stressed their voluntarist interpretation of Jewish tradition and its practice, most interviewees in Germany could not ignore the ascribed-inherited nature of their Jewish identification. Their national-institutional German identification was also accepted as an ascribed fact.

Among the Jewish German individuals who migrated into Israel, their Jewish national identification is asserted mostly through ancestral symbolic resources. Although all of the interviewees maintain their German nationality, their German identification in Israel is represented by a cultural symbolic resource and not an institutional one. Mirroring the construction of the Jewish identification in Germany, German identification in Israel is considered to be ascribed by birth, but its presence in the participants' everyday lives is voluntarist.

A second important finding relates to the role of networks in the construction of national identification: Networks are often postulated as markers of national membership. Thus, the participants often use the social ties with members of a respective group to demonstrate their membership or the lack thereof. For the most part, networks were understood as voluntarist – individuals choosing their friends. However, these choices are always made within a specific opportunity structure. In Germany, this structure was limited by parents, the number of Jews in the community and other factors. In Israel, it was limited by the relatively low probability that the participants and their offspring have to make contact with a non-Jewish German person.

Our findings demonstrate that the Holocaust is clearly present in the cognitions of German-Jewish individuals, primarily among those living in Germany. This, however, does not prevent them from integrating their Jewish and German identifications. In this regard, our exploration yielded a significant contribution, allowing us to draw a distinction between an integration that allows one to feel part German and part Jewish, and an integration that implies the emergence of a new hybrid (German-Israeli) category (Benet-Martinezetal.2002). The first form of integration applies to interviewees who reside in Germany. For these individuals, the integration of a German and an Israeli identifications is an effort that also implies a cognitive dissonance: they feel comfortable there but are also alerted to the threat of assimilation and the loss of their Jewish identification.

The second form of integration characterizes the interviewees in Israel. As members of a Jewish majority in a country defined as Jewish, these interviewees do not consider it necessary to assert their Jewish membership by practicing Jewish costumes and religious traditions. Relieved from the threat

of assimilation, they are able to maintain their German culture without having to sacrifice their Jewish one. In other words, as the cultural symbolic resources that mark the boundaries between Jews and other Germans fade, the boundaries themselves become blurred (Alba 2005).

Reflecting on the acculturation model, we would like to stress the important role of context in the selection of integration strategies: in Germany, the maintenance of a Jewish culture contradicts with the accepted notion of German-ness. In Israel, however, the participants describe a freedom to practice their German culture that does not hamper their acceptance as (Jewish) Israelis.

One question left open in this study is whether the Israeli context enables the emergence of this new category or if it is the migration out of Germany. In other words, would a German-Jewish category emerge also in a different non-German context that is not Israel? Future Explorations of Jewish and German identification will thus benefit most from adding a third group to the comparison, namely German Jews who migrated out of Germany, but not to Israel. This group would provide a deeper understanding of the complex relations between German-ness and Jewish-ness, outside Germany and outside the context of Israel.

Another string from the findings described above worth pulling relates to the emergence of a hybrid hyphenated self-identification in the Israeli context. Specifically, we wonder what role the privileged status of the interviewees we met in Israel might play in their ability to actively nurture their foreign identification.

Notes

1. Following Smith (1991) and Joppke (2004), we view both German and Jewish national identifications as leaning more towards the ethnic national identity type, but not as strictly ethnic.
2. As members of the Ashkenazi group, the majority of Ashkenazi Jews hold a relatively high socio-economic position (Bar-Haim and Semyonov 2015)
3. ‘Jeckes' is a term used to refer to German (Jewish) immigrants who arrived in Israel in the 1930s-1950s. Some maintain that it is related to the word Jacke (jacket, in German), while others maintain it is an acronym of Yehudi Kshe Havana (slow-witted Jew, in Hebrew).
4. The camps are summer camps organized by the German Zionist youth movement (ZJD).

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

References

Alba, R. 2005. “Bright vs. Blurred Boundaries: Second Generation Assimilation and Exclusion in France, Germany, and the United States.” Ethnic and Racial Studies 28 (1): 20-49. doi: 10.1080/0141987042000280003.

Alexander, J. C. 2004. “Toward a Theory of Cultural Trauma. Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity.” In Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity, edited by J. C. Alexander, R. Eyerman, G. Bernhard, N. J. Smelser, and S. Pioter, 1-30. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bar-Haim, E. and M. Semyonov. 2015. “Ethnic Stratification in Israel.” In The International Handbook of the Demography of Race and Ethnicity, edited by R. Sáenz, D. G. Embrick, and N. P. Rodnguez, 323-337. Dordrecht: Springer.

Benet-Martinez, V., J. Leu, F. Lee, and M. W. Morris. 2002. “Negotiating Biculturalism: Cultural Frame Switching in Biculturals with Oppositional Versus Compatible Cultural Identities.” Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 33 (5): 492-516. doi: 10.1177/0022022102033005005.

Berry, J. W. 1990. “Psychology of Acculturation.” In Cross-Cultural Perspectives: Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, edited by J. Berman, 201-235. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Berry, J. W. 1997. “Immigration, Acculturation, and Adaptation.” Applied Psychology 46 (1): 5-34. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.1997.tb01087.x.

Berry, J. W. and D. L. Sam. 1997. “Acculturation and Adaptation.” In Social Behavior and Applications, edited by J. W. Berry, H. S. Marshall, and K. Cigdem, 291-326. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bhabha, H. 1997. “Life at the Border: Hybrid Identities of the Present.” New Perspectives Quarterly 14 (1): 30-31.

Breakwell, G. M. 2001. “Social Representational Constraints upon Identity Processes.” In Representations of the Social: Bridging Theoretical Traditions, edited by K. Deaux and G. Philogene, 271-284. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Brubaker, R. 1989. Immigration and the Politics of Citizenship in Europe and North America. Lanham: University Press of America.

Brubaker, R. 1992. Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brubaker, R. 1996. Nationalism Reframed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gavison, R. 1998. “A Jewish and Democratic State: Challenges and Risks.” In Multiculturalism in a Democratic and Jewish State: The Ariel Rosen Tzvi Memorial Book, edited by M. Mautner, A. Sagi, and R. Shamir, 213-278. Tel Aviv: Ramot.

Gong, L. 2007. “Ethnic Identity and Identification with the Majority Group: Relations with National Identity and Self-Esteem.” International Journal of Intercultural Relations 31 (4): 503-523. doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2007.03.002.

Haberfeld, Y. and Y. Cohen. 2007. “Gender, Ethnic, and National Earnings Gaps in Israel: The Role of Rising Inequality.” Social Science Research 36 (2): 654-672. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2006.02.001.

Haug, S. and M. Wolf. 2006. “Jüdische Zuwanderung Nach Deutschland. [Jewish Immigration into Germany].” In Materialen Zu Bevölkerungswissenschaft, edited by F. Swiaczny and S. Haug. Wiesbaden: Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung.

Heath, A. F. and J. Tilly. 2005. “National Identity and Attitudes Towards Migrants Findings from the ISSP.” International Journal on Multicultural Societies 7 (2): 82-156.

Hill, C. E., B. J. Thompson, and E. S. Williams. 1997. “A Guide to Conducting Consensual, and Counseling Qualitative Research.” Counsaling Psychologist 25: 517-572. doi: 10.1177/0011000097254001.

Hjerm, M. 1998. “National Identity: A comparison of Sweden, Germany and Australia.” Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies 24 (3): 451-469. doi: 10.1080/ 1369183X.1998.9976644.

Jones, F. L. and P. Smith. 2001. “Diversity and Commonality in National Identities: An Exploratory Analysis of Cross-National Patterns.” Journal of Sociology 37 (1): 45-63. doi: 10.1177/144078301128756193.

Joppke, C. 1999. “How Immigration Is Changing Citizenship: A Comparative View.” Ethnic and Racial Studies 22 (4): 629-652. doi: 10.1080/014198799329323.

Joppke, C. 2004. “The Retreat of Multiculturalism in the Liberal State.” The British Journal of Sociology 55 (2): 237-257. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-4446.2004.00017.x.

Joppke, C. 2007. “Beyond National Models: Civic Integration Policies for Immigrants in Western Europe.” West European Politics 30 (1): 1-22. doi: 10.1080/ 01402380601019613.

Kaufmann, E. 2008. “The Lenses of Nationhood : An Optical Model of Identity.” Nations and Nationalism 14 (3): 449-477. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8129.2008.00357.x.

Kohn, H. 1962. The Age of Nationalism: The First Era of Global History. Westport Ct: Greenwood Press.

Kohn, H. 1994. “Western and Eastern Nationalism.” In Nationalism, edited by J. Hutchinson and A. D. Smith, 162-165. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kunovich, R. M. 2009. “The Sources and Consequences of National Identification.” American Sociological Review 74 (4): 573-593. doi: 10.1177/000312240907400404.

LaFromboise, T., H. L. K. Coleman, and J. Gerton. 1993. “Psychological Impact of Biculturalism: Evidence and Theory.” Psychological Bulletin 114 (3): 395-412. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.114.3.395.

Lang, B. 2005. “Hyphenated-Jews and the Anxiety of Identity.” Jewish Social Studies 12 (1): 1-15. doi: 10.2979/JSS.2005.12.1.1.

Patton, M. Q. 2001. Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Phinney, J. S. 1991. “Ethnic Identity and Self-Esteem: A Review and Integration.” Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences 13 (2): 193-208. doi: 10.1177/ 07399863910132005.

Raijman, R. and O. Hochman. 2011. “National Attachments, Economic Competition, and Social Exclusion of Non-Ethnic Migrants in Israel: A Mixed-Methods Approach.” Quality and Quantity 45 (6): 1151-1174. doi: 10.1007/s11135-009-9284-1.

Raijman, R. and M. Semyonov. 1997. “Gender, Ethnicity, and Immigration: Double Disadvantage and Triple Disadvantage among Recent Immigrant Women in the Israeli Labor Market.” Gender & Society 11 (1): 108-125. doi: 10.1177/089124397011001007.

Schwartz, S. J. 2005. “A New Identity for Identity Research: Recommendations for Expanding and Refocusing the Identity Literature.” Journal of Adolescent Research 20 (3): 293-308. doi: 10.1177/0743558405274890.

Semyonov, M. and N. Lewin-Epstein. 2015. “Wealth Inequality: Ethnic Disparities in Israeli Society.” Social Forces 76 (2): 711-713. doi: 10.1353/sof.2011.0006.

Smith, A. D. 1991. National Identity. London: Penguin.

Smooha, S. 2004. “Jewish Ethnicity in Israel: Symbolic or Real?” In Jews in Israel: Contemporary Social and Cultural Patterns, edited by U. Rebhun and H. I. Waxman, 47-80. Hanover, NH: Brandies University Press.

Stets, J. E. and P. J. Burke. 2000. “Identity Theory and Social Identity Theory.” Social Psychology Quarterly 63 (3): 224-237. doi: 10.2307/2695870.

Strauss, A. and J. Corbin. 1990. Basics of Qualitative Research. Vol. 15. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Weissbrod, L. 1983. “Religion as National Identity in a Secular Society.” Review of Religious Research 24 (3): 188-205. doi: 10.2307/3511814.

Wimmer, A. 2008. “The Making and Unmaking of Ethnic Boundaries: A Multilevel Process Theory.” American Sociological Review 113 (4): 970-1022. doi: 10.1086/ 522803.

Zimmer, O. 2003. “Boundary Mechanisms and Symbolic Resources: Towards a Process-Oriented Approach to National Identity.” Nations and Nationalism 9 (2): 173-193. doi: 10.1111/1469-8219.00081.